The queer times of internet infrastructure and digital systems

Daniel Cockayne (University of Waterloo)
Lizzie Richardson (Durham University)

Abstract

This chapter examines the queer temporalities of the internet. Our starting point is that space cannot be adequately theorised without reference to time. Geographers have theorised the spatial structure of internet infrastructures, but they have paid less attention to the temporal structure of these systems. Contemporary queer theory provides analyses of temporality as a critique of the heteronormative-reproductive times of state-capitalism, which also characterise imaginaries of digital systems. Instead of the internet as a necessarily futuristic invention, we demonstrate the necessity of thinking through the concrete histories and embodied presents of the internet. We first conceptualise internet infrastructures as historical anachronism - evidence of the continuing inequalities of colonialism. Then we examine how queer presence online can lend itself to a troubling of modern temporalities.

Keywords: digital media, glitch, internet, space-time, queer temporality

1 Introduction

This chapter challenges some of the dominant ways of thinking about the temporal structure of the internet. Geographers and other scholars have been quick to redress the dominant spatial imaginaries associated with internet infrastructures (Dodge & Kitchin, 2005; M. Graham, 2011; 2013; S. Graham, 1998; Kirsch, 1995; Kitchin, 1998; Zook, 2000), though fewer scholars have examined the temporal imaginaries that underwrite internet systems and the effects of these imaginaries. As Doreen Massey (2005, p. 47) influentially argued, there is an "interconnectedness of conceptualisations of space and conceptualisations of time," meriting thinking through space and time together and moving from a separation of these concepts to "space-time" as one simultaneous idea. Our attempt to think through the temporality of internet infrastructures follows from interventions in queer theory that have sought to counter heteronormative understandings of temporality. Queer critics have challenged the temporal logics that underpin the reproduction of the nuclear family (Edelmen, 2004), or understandings of queer pasts as abject and queer presents or futures as necessarily progressive (Love, 2007).

Queer theory may be particularly suitable to the task of thinking through the temporal imaginaries of digital infrastructures because of the relative contemporaneity of queer theory and the commercial web browser - both often narrated in their inception as early 1990s phenomena. Writings on queer futurity emphasise asynchronous temporalities, time out of joint, non-linear time, and time out of sync with the reproduction of capital or of the nation state. These perspectives allow space and time for feeling backwards, disoriented, and out of alignment with the normative organization of society. However these possibilities for temporal disjuncture and malfunction are contrary to dominant imaginaries of the internet that tend to narrate it as a system of instantaneous presence in a 'networks of networks' in which space and time collapse, rendering distance meaningless so that time becomes perfectly coordinated. Geographers have done much to counter these assumptions by illustrating the continuing unevenness of access to the web, and the differential geography of internet infrastructure. The internet in critical geographers' framing is a system that, though often hidden, has a distinct and material geography that reproduces the unevenness and inequality of state and capitalist violence.

This geographical perspective provides a starting point for our queer temporality by connecting the modern digital systems with an imperialist past in ways that challenge the idea of the

internet as having a time without history. Nicole Starosielski (2015) details these themes, examining the historical development of contemporary internet infrastructures through undersea cables that have been laid along trenches dug out for 19th Century systems of telegraphy. The modern internet is a system built upon legacies of British colonialism, implicating its contemporary material geography in today's prevailing patterns of global inequality. In emphasising the history of the internet, Starosielski and others like Janet Abbate (1999) demonstrate the militaristic and academic beginnings of early internet technologies, and defy common imaginaries of the internet as essentially of the present or the future - and by implication, lacking some of its fundamental spatial and temporal dimensions.

The spaces most essential to the continued working of the internet are those least-often associated with its functioning in the popular imaginary - undersea networks, beaches, islands, and rural spaces for infrastructure like data centres that function as key nodes and connections. These kinds of spaces are berthing points without which the essential function of maintaining key internet infrastructures would be far more difficult or fundamentally different. So connecting the modern internet with its imperialist past, as well as rendering it in its 'proper' place of islands, rural areas, and the deep ocean, is a necessary first step in queering our attitude toward the internet as a system commonly thought as without time and place. Attention to this material geography enables the appearance of an internet that is strangely outmoded by a past of which it attempts to divest itself. Far from the zenith of modernity to which its popular imaginaries attempt to lay claim, the internet becomes anachronistic, anchored on past and continuing inequalities that heteronormative futurity would prefer to forget.

From this beginning, our aim in this chapter is to draw on different ideas of temporality from contemporary queer theory, and to think through alternative ways of conceptualizing the internet and its infrastructures, outside of the dominant tempo of biopolitical state-capitalism (Zalnieriute, 2018). Our intention is not to frame the internet as less pernicious and dangerous for queer lives than it indeed is, but to seek value in multiple conceptualisations that can be held together ambivalently. This is based on the conviction that "everyday theory qualitatively affects everyday knowledge and experience" (Sedgwick, 2003, p. 144-145). In order not to reproduce the internet with a capital 'I' as a totalising force bent on the eradication of lives and bodies not in alignment with the state-capitalist agenda, it is necessary to find ways to conceptualize it differently, as a complex and ambivalent multiplicity (see also Gibson-Graham, 2014). While recognising the threat of highly discretionary and only-sometimes-convivial state-capitalism associated with internet systems, for many LGBTQ people digital systems are also necessary for everyday survival (Jenzen, 2017).

The queer theorisation of the internet we present here attempts to hold these two asymmetrical realities together - the threats and the opportunities - without attempting to resolve them, so as to conceptualize the internet queerly as a problematic object out of sync with its own representations of itself. In this sense, we attempt a "suturing of two times but leaving both times visible as such" (Freeman, 2010, p. 69). In the next section, we draw on Elizabeth Freeman's (2010) concept of temporal drag to outline the beginnings of this suturing. We then develop these points by building upon Lauren Berlant's (2016) framings of glitches in infrastructures of presence. We conclude with the merits of conceptualising a complex object like the internet through multiple spatio-temporalities that allow for the flourishing of a perspective that privileges difference and ambivalence (Ruez & Cockayne, forthcoming).

2 Internet infrastructure as temporal drag

Freeman (2010, p. 93) develops the concept of temporal drag to describe how identity is "constituted and haunted by the failed love-projects that precedes it" in which, as a critique of

temporalities, one aim is "to feel the tug backward as a potentially transformative part of movement itself." Freeman persistently links temporal drag to her concept of time binds that describes both a problem and an attachment - for example to identity categories - that has a temporal structure that often remains hidden. Through these ideas, she examines the supposedly foreclosed promises of past liberation movements to see what gets stuck; becomes anachronistic; *does not* progress but instead moves sideways, or not at all; and how the demands of the past may seem incongruous to the demands of the present. Temporal drag is deployed as a temporal reappraisal of Judith Butler's (1990) notion of performativity. Freeman's (2010, p. 62) critique of performativity is that the concept unfolds an understanding of temporality in which "time is basically progressive, insofar as repetitions with differences hold the most promises." She explains further:

> "Repetitions with any backward-looking force are 'citational,' but Butler tends to read these as consolidating the authority of a fantasised original, even if citationality itself unsettles the idea of an original: in *Gender Trouble*'s 'repetition with a difference,' the crucial difference seems to be novelty, not anachronism. Ordinary masculine and feminine performativity are retroactive, of course, but not in a way that intersects with any actual past, for the 'original' sexed body that seems to guarantee the gendered subject's authenticity is in fact a back-formation, a kind of hologram projected onto earlier moments" (Freeman, 2010, p. 63).

Freeman's critique is that Butler ignores the lived reality of the past, substituting for actually-experienced-temporalities a citational simulacrum against which the representational fiction of gendered performances reproduces itself. Butler therefore ends up, perhaps inadvertently, privileging the novel queer futures of non-normative performances in ways that Freeman (2010, p. 63) argues, "are symptomatic of late-finance capitalism before the crashes of the early twenty-first century." In doing so, performativity dismisses earlier feminist and lesbian models of thought such as the supposed anachronisms of - for example - femininity and butch/femme as available models for change, rallying points, or opportunities for solidarity.

Similarly, Freeman claims that in Butler's model of normative masculinity and femininity - heterosexual melancholia - the lost but unknowledgeable object of homosexual desire that forms the condition for heterosexuality is evacuated of its historical specificity. This is because for Freeman (2010, p. 70) identification is not an Oedipal repudiation, but instead a more complex "story of disjunctive, sticky entanglements and associations." For Freeman then, these figures of, first, the radical feminist for the queer subject, and second, the same-sex parent for the normative straight subject, are superseded by the reality of the repeated simulacrum in a way that problematically disavows the past and places the potential for radical change in an only-future oriented performativity. The actual past cannot *really* be felt since it becomes only a symbolic backdrop to be repeated or transgressed in the present. The figure of the drag queen thus becomes the privileged subject of a progressive gender politics and transformative difference. In this light, Freeman asks what looking back to radical feminism might afford to contemporary queer theory.

How might we fold these notions of temporal drag and time binds that are based on questions of subjectivity into a temporal re-theorisation of internet infrastructures and digital systems? These systems appear to always and only point toward "new" technologies, developmental frontiers, and narratives of liberal progress and progressive change. Technology, and specifically internet-driven technologies, are so often communicated in terms of the supposed 'transformative difference' of libertarian-liberal digital utopianism (i.e., innovation, iteration, pivoting, and disruption; see Turner, 2006) that forms the key to Freeman's critique of the temporal structure of performativity. What now-seeming-anachronous histories and aphorisms of the past might trouble the contemporary temporal imaginary of digital technology? Emphasising the histories of the

internet and digital technologies, and how their present function is dependent on and constituted by these oft-forgotten pasts may one way to do this. Freeman (2010, p. 64, original emphasis) describes temporal drag as "a *productive* obstacle to progress, a usefully distorting pull backward and a necessary pressure on the present tense." In giving the internet a history, its temporal imaginary may be one that is no longer oriented only toward the future. To theorize internet infrastructures and digital systems as a form of temporal drag in the manner that Freeman intends, it's important to examine how forgotten, repressed, and lost pasts *come back*, are folded into the present, and persist, in spite of attempts to defend against them. In casting the internet through histories of empire - most obviously in the context of 19th century British colonialism and the cold-war politics of the mid-20th century US - we can connect past moments of constitutive minority politics to see how they continue to structure the contemporary.

Situating a critical history of internet infrastructures as a destabilising of its future-oriented temporalities is a much longer task than we have space for here. However, it is worth highlighting some key historical moments in order to complicate the synonymy that 'modernity' and 'internet' seems to easily achieve. Freeman suggests that a queer historiography should be conceptualised in terms of *feeling*, rather than being conceptualised in terms of *understanding*, in which the historian situates herself in a position of relative mastery over her object - history - that is then organised as a more or less continuous and linear narrative. In this vein then, we might feel our way into histories of the internet through the laying of undersea cables, mentioned above, that open up a host of events illustrating the incoherent development of digital systems.

Early- to mid-20th century developments in mathematics that implicate both the modern personal computer and the atomic bomb were deeply embedded in militaristic and public spending (Dyson, 2012). Other key events include Grace Hopper's 1952 invention of the compiler, and the parallel development in the US and UK of packet-switching technologies in the 1960s (Abbate, 1999). The first ARPANET connection (the first network that utilised modern TCP/IP protocols) was made in 1969 between UCLA and Stanford. Concern with these developments, with an archetypically post-WWII cold-war inflection, was for systems of security and redundancy with a military focus that are features of paramount importance in both the network and packet-switching. As many scholars and writers argue, the internet is central in a logistics network that facilitates the organisation of a highly financialised global capitalism (Cowen, 2014), as well as a dense system of predominantly US-governed state surveillance (Paglen, 2010). Despite these complex and overlapping histories, the first web browsers made available during the 1990s characterise most popular modern internet and temporally sediments dial-up internet and web usage as an archetype of 1990s popular culture. The 1990s also saw the privatisation of internet technology, which undermines common theorisations of the internet as holding a radical democratic potential (Zalnieriute, 2018). As geographers remind us, internet infrastructures and digital systems continue to underwrite the modern politics of international warfare and the highly sophisticated methods of killing that have accompanied them (Smith, 1992). To view the spatio-temporal structure of the internet in these terms - as a complex historical mix of public and private interests, academic and military concerns, and implicating histories from the high points of 19th Century British colonialism and 20th Century US imperialism, that stretch back 150 years even in a narrow historiography is one way to feel the temporal drag of the modern internet and its usage. In doing so, we can view the internet less as proleptic and more as anachronistic.

Continuing along these lines, Freeman (2010, p. 68) describes how temporal drag might

involve "resuscitating obsolete cultural signs," "embarrassing pre-histories," "the love of failure,"[1] and "the rescue of ephemera." Here we might point to the quotidian sensation that accompanies the circulation of aphorism online in which the late 2010s' experience of internet use is folded back into the 1990s. This might include being directed through a Google search to now rarely-used websites like MapQuest, coming across a static-HTML Web 1.0 read-only site,[2] or the sonic warping that occurs when the sound of dial-up internet (for example when watching an old television show or used as a novelty ringtone) meets the 21st Century era. Meme culture and the circulation of viral content often self-consciously draws attention to the 1990s fashion and music (or, in the common 'rick-rolling' meme, 1987, which might still *feel* like the 1990s), designating the web as an 'originally' Gen Y space that may confound newer Gen Z users. Imagining the internet as an obsessively archival, referential, and inter-textual space also complicates and contorts chrononormative imaginaries, given the archive's common association with material spaces and physical boxes that contain documents solidly located in the past. In this sense, the digitisation of archival materials presents an osmotic membrane between past and present. Similarly, it seems that many facets of the internet are in a rapid process of becoming-archive even as we use them. What seeming-staples of today's internet usage might join the ranks of Napster, Myspace, ICQ, AltaVista in the near-future? With these examples, the hubris of the planned obsolesce of commodity-time (Freeman, 2010, p. 89) that characterizes the production of many historical and modern technologies (e.g., the automobile and the smartphone) may collapse awkwardly into the market failure of an *unplanned* obsolescence. If temporal drag is about preserving the improper object of the past as a way to disorientate the hegemonies of the present and future, asserting these perhaps more cultural and playful aspects of temporal folding and collapse may be one way to juxtapose this improper object against the present moment.

These latter examples point to the disjunction - that we suggest is a temporal as well as a spatial one - between, on the one side, the geopolitical and capitalist realities of internet infrastructures and, on the other, their usage. This is something like "a way of forcing the present to touch its own disavowed past or seemingly outlandish possible future" (Freeman, 2010, p. 78). This doubling and juxtaposition of an object (e.g., internet infrastructure or digital systems) that is-not-itself characterises the concept of temporal drag, which seeks to take seriously how histories remain stubbornly contemporaneous with presents, despite attempts at disavowal and performative turns toward novel iteration. It is the second of these twin temporalities to which we now turn, moving from (in this section) a discussion of the internet infrastructures and digital systems as a kind of anachronism, to thinking (in the next) through queer presence online.

3 Queer presence online: network time and the glitch

What is queer presence online? Any answer to this question must begin by addressing presence as a problem of both queer theory and studies of mediation. Regarding the former, there is a general ambivalence surrounding presence in the constitution of queer experience. This can be traced in the concern with histories and futures denoted by the turn to temporality in queer theory (Dinshaw et al., 2007). Such a desire to retrieve lost histories or (im)possible futures that are named queer responds to an uncertain politics of the "post-recognition" present in Western LGBTQ experience. Recognition of LGBTQ individuals, most notably through the extension of marriage to same-sex couples in many countries, has meant that what were non-normative sexual practices lose some of

[1] We understand this failure in the sense that Jack Halberstam (2011) intends it, not in the language of digital media firms to "fail forward" in which failure is a kind of startup hazing strategy, but in the sense of a failure to adhere to the modes of subjectivity that characterize heteronormativity.

[2] It's interesting to observe that the term 'Web 1.0' is itself a retronym.

their distinctiveness as a defining marker of queer identity (Halley & Parker, 2011). One result of this has been the dissipation of senses of oppositional struggle that propel political movement, producing a lack of direction that mirrors the questioning of anti-normativity as the signature critical move of queer theory (Weigman & Wilson, 2015). It is unclear what exactly is queer about the present moment, and how queer presence can be known as such. Even before thinking about mediation then, queer presence has an ambiguous constitution. Mediation itself also alerts us to the insufficiencies of any account of absolute presence. It evokes the necessary role of transmission between a live presence and the reception of it. In this way, media construct a sense of presence that is qualified through the clarity and accuracy of the transmission process. The quality of mediation can be judged through the proximity of the space and time of the transmitted experience to the present event. Thus, if the problem of presence in queer theory is one of definition and constitution; through mediation it becomes one of transmission and proximity.

From this more general problem of presence, we might look to particular features of the present of contemporary media that could constitute queer experience online. To understand this, first it is necessary to consider how the conditions of online presence reconfigure relationships between representation and temporality. One way of defining online presence is through the representations that take the form of the update, the uploading of content, and may entail a self-narration through the curation of one's personal profile. In these cases, representation moves from being a more cognitive reference to past events, to a formal and action-oriented process directed towards the future. Rather than functioning in a descriptive mode, producing what Roland Barthes (1968) termed "reality effects" through an historical time, representation becomes an operation of probability, producing a predictive, communicative temporality (Halpern, 2014, p. 50). Thus, that which previously fixed the present through reference to the past instead becomes constructive of potential presence through transmission into the future. Containing no grammar by which to problematize their abstraction from space and time (Halpern, 2014), these are representations that do not speak of experience but rather seem to produce the immediacy of the now. This condition of contemporary mediation has been termed 'liveness' to denote the "new coordinated forms of social reality manifest in the contemporary social world" (Back & Puwar, 2012, p. 7). Extending the transformations rendered by previous new media, like television (Williams, 1974), the sensation of liveness is moved closer to the processes for knowing such experience so that the representations of being live are even more entangled in its occurrence.

Secondly, this live performance constructed through the generation of representations means that online presence occurs through network time (Hassan, 2007). This is a time that is reliant on multi-directional processes of transmission created and inhabited by people and ICTs together. Network time generates asynchronous spaces in which connection and direction occur through the flows and rhythms of communication with others, rather than organised by the disembedded linear time of the clock. The desire to continuously update or narrate the present can be understood within this context, fulfilling the demand for content generation that through its transmission produces a live presence that is realised asynchronously through connections with multiple nodes in the network. As has been well documented, this time of the network can be construed as alienating. Manuel Castells (1996), for example, saw network time as a non-time of an extended present of flows that is sealed off from localities. Likewise, Paul Virilio (1998) envisaged the "real-time" of the network as moving outside of human experience, a nonlived machine time. In this sense, the demands of the network for constant transmission of observation and participation extend processes of modern subject formation wrought through engagement in spectacular culture (Crary, 1999). The construction of the spectacle is "not founded on the necessity of making a subject see, but rather on strategies in which individuals are isolated, separated and inhabit time as disempowered" (Crary, 1999, p. 3). Jonathan Crary (2013, p. 29) later deepens this depressing

analysis in his depiction of a contemporary 24/7 temporality as "a time without time" that "celebrates an hallucination of presence, of an unalterable permanence composed of incessant, frictionless operations." Drawing on Hannah Arendt, Crary (2013, p. 21) sees the command of this 24/7 temporality as an assault on sleep, and thus on domesticity and the "twilight that suffuses our private and intimate life."

It is possible then to paint a picture of online presence as that which creates a condition of liveness, but one that tends towards alienation rather than shared experience. However, considering what might be queer about online presence can provide an alternative account. One aspect of this is a critique of the claim that networked time is necessarily alienating. As in the previous section, this could follow the queer temporalities literature that challenges the logic of a homogeneous, linear time of reproduction (see also Edelman, 2004). Equally though, a closer attention to the experience of network time indicates the potential for all online presence to *become queer*. There are two issues here. The first is that accounts of online presence as uniform tend to either underplay the body or rely on a simplistic model of embodiment. As Mike Crang (2007, p. 69) argues, the interest in and valorisation of speed of transmission in these accounts of the network sketch a general picture of a temporal order in which "the everyday and the bodily gets coded as the authentic and slow." In other words, they fail to address the nuanced ways in which bodies already experience time differently, variations in rhythm that do not necessarily individualise but rather require nuanced forms of cooperation. This means that intimacy then, contra Crary (2013), does not pre-exist the forms of spatial and temporal organisation through which it occurs; with a morphology that manifests not through "some abstract frame of reference but producing shared time-space relevancies and shared coordinates" (Crary, 2013, p. 76). Network time thus extends syncopated or aleatory rhythms, that have long been necessary for queer intimacies, to diversify practices of intimate life.

Without a sufficiently nuanced approach to embodiment, the second issue is that the potential for heterogeneous experiences of time and space is undermined. The multiple shifting morphologies of intimacy that may emerge through the network result from the "fragmentation of episodes into smaller and smaller 'units' thereby increasing the challenge of co-ordinating what become separate events" (Shove, 2002, cited in Crang, 2007, p. 69). Whilst this certainly creates problems of squeezed time, and temporal overflow (Southerton, 2003; Jarvis & Pratt, 2006), Robert Hassan (2007, p. 52) argues that there is a form of freedom in the network as "temporal experience becomes disconnected from the local clock time of the users." This means control over time is experienced "once more through our own contextual self-creation of it" (Hassan, 2007, p. 45). Individuals begin to have a feeling for time through the relations of the network, though they may no longer have a standardised measure for its understanding. The example Hassan (2007, p. 45) gives to evoke this sense, rather than meter, of time is communication with others, where one can "get to the point where the clock does not matter, so deeply have we shared the flow and rhythm of the constructed time" of the conversation. The implication of this is a social experience of time that is not dictated by an external temporal order, but rather allows for more unfamiliar, more unexpected temporalities. Thus, the time of the network is in no way simply one of alienated and individualised presence, but rather a queer one that affords opportunities for a reworking of experiences of shared temporality, including the reconfiguration of intimacies.

Queer presence online might have another form too, one that disturbs the apparently alienating temporality of the network in a more material manner. This form is a presence that disrupts communicative operations, a *glitch* that stops them working the way they should. The glitch is "a troubled transmission" (Berlant, 2016, p. 393), a disturbance in the seamless communication that constructs the liveness of the network. For Berlant (2016, p. 393), the glitch is an interruption in "the conditions of the reproduction of life", and thus one that might challenge familial models of

generation and transmission. More than this though, the glitch is an aesthetic that denotes a certain state of continuity amidst a shift, but one that is incoherent and uncongealed (Berlant, 2011, p. 198). In this context, the glitch has some purpose but one that cannot be comprehended within an existing system of meaning or order (Nunes, 2012). Technical failure echoes a broader hermeneutic and interpretive failure (Kane, 2016, p. 130). In this way, the glitch aesthetic produces the sort of anti-social relation that has appeared in contemporary queer theory (Caserio et al., 2006). Through a rhetoric of "anti-communication" (Kane, 2016, p. 129), it causes complexity and obfuscation by emphasising the background noise that is normally filtered out (Cascone, 2000). The indeterminacy of (queer) presence is confronted by retaining and indeed focusing on, incommunicability that is constitutive of any networked transmission. Thus, the glitch operates as both material and aesthetic failure in the communication network, an online presence, which like the ambivalence of contemporary queer experience, breaks up its own conditions of appearance.

4 Conclusion

This chapter has conceptualised the internet through writing on temporalities that derives from queer experience. In doing so, our aim has not been to diminish the real dangers that the internet poses as a system of global surveillance aligned with the chrononormativity of state-capitalism that is so often antagonistic toward queer lives, bodies, and to expressions of difference in general. The urgency of these dangers can be witnessed, for example, in revelations regarding Facebook's role in the circulation and dissemination of propaganda, and the role of such propaganda in electoral politics in the United States. Yet, it is important to be able to hold multiple imaginaries of spatio-temporality in mind to recognize that objects are rarely only one thing; they are rarely totalising, monolithic, and intransigent in all circumstances.

With these thoughts in mind, we presented the internet in terms of temporal drag to show how oft forgotten pasts are related to present-day internet infrastructures. Here we drew attention to how the internet is already out-of-sync with its dominant representations. As a 19th and 20th Century technology, the internet is the result of British and American imperialisms, with material geographies and histories that tend to be underplayed. Conceptualising digital systems as *archives* evokes them as a retainer and mobiliser of the past, as intertextual, citational, and self-referential. We then turned to embodied experiences of the present of internet usage to show how the body tends to resist normative temporalities. This is a tendency that continues through the glitches in transmission that often break up appearances of (embodied) presence with digital systems. Together these observations point to an already-queer conceptualisation of the internet characterised by indeterminacy, forgotten pasts that nevertheless fold itinerancy and undecidability into the present.

Our suggestion is not to resolve the tension between these two conceptualisations - between the internet as an aspect of homophobic state-capitalist hegemony, and a necessary opportunity for resistance to that hegemony. Such a tension cannot, and arguable should not, be resolved. Instead it is productive to imagine internet infrastructures and digital systems through the incommensurability of these two conceptualisations, to magnify the tension rather than to (re)solve it. Imaging the internet in terms of its ambivalence allows for a diversity of queer, contradictory experiences that shape, as well as being shaped by, this spatial-temporal system. Though this chapter has not been exhaustive in terms of this theorizing, it makes a start in understanding this ambivalence.

5 References

Abbate, J. (1999). *Inventing the Internet*. Cambridge: The MIT Press.

Back, L., & Puwar, N. (2012). A manifesto for live methods: provocations and capacities. *The Sociological Review*, *60*(S1), 6-17.

Barthes, R. (1968). *The Rustle of Language*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Berlant, L. (2011). *Cruel Optimism*. Durham: Duke University Press.
Berlant, L. (2016). The commons: infrastructure for troubling times. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, *34*(3), 393-419.
Butler, J. (1990). *Gender Trouble*. London: Routledge.
Cascone, K. (2000). The aesthetics of failure: 'post-digital' tendencies in contemporary computer music. *Computer Music Journal*, *24*(4), 12-18.
Caserio, R., Edelman, L., Halberstam, J., Muñoz, J. E., & Dean, T. (2006). The antisocial thesis in queer theory. *Modern Languages Association*, *121*(2), 819-828.
Castells, M. (1996). *The Rise of the Network Society*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
Cockayne, D., & Richardson, L. (2017). Queering code/space: the co-production of socio-spatial codes and technology. *Gender, Place & Culture*, *24*(11), 1642-1658.
Cowen, D. (2014). *The Deadly Life of Logistics: Mapping Violence in Global Trade*. Minneapolis: Minnesota University Press.
Crang, M. (2007). Speed = distance / time: chronotopographies of action. In R. Hassan and R.E. Purser (eds) *24/7: Time and Temporality in the Network Society*. Stanford: Stanford Business Books, pp. 62-88.
Crary, J. (1999). *Suspensions of Perception: Attention, Spectacle, and Modern Culture*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
Crary, J. (2013). *24/7: Late Capitalism and the End of Sleep*. London: Verso.
Dinshaw, C., Edelman, L., Ferguson, R., Freccero, C., Freeman, E., Halberstam, J., Jagose, A., Nealon, C., & Nguyen, T. (2007). Theorizing queer temporalities: a roundtable discussion. *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies*, *13*(2), 177-95.
Dodge, M., & Kitchin, R. (2005). Code and the Transduction of Space. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, *95*(1), 162-180.
Dyson, G. (2012). *Turing's Cathedral: The Origins of the Digital Universe*. New York: Vintage.
Edelman, L. (2004). *No Future: Queer Theory and the Death Drive*. Durham: Duke University Press.
Freeman, E. (2010). *Time Binds: Queer Temporalities, Queer Histories*. Durham: Duke University Press.
Gibson-Graham, J. K. (2014). Rethinking the economy with thick description and weak theory. *Cultural Anthropology*, *55*(S9), S147-S153.
Gieseking, J. (2017). Messing with the attractiveness algorithm: a response to queering code/space. *Gender, Place & Culture*, *24*(11), 1659-1665.
Graham, M. (2011). Time machines and virtual portals: the spatialities of the digital divide. *Progress in Development Studies*, *11*(3). 211-227.
Graham, M. (2013). Geography/internet: ethereal alternative dimensions of cyberspace or grounded augmented realities? *The Geographical Journal*, *179*(2), 177-182.
Graham, S. (1998). The end of geography or the explosion of place? Conceptualizing space, place and information technology. *Progress in Human Geography*, *22*(2), 165-185.
Halberstam, J. (2011). *The Queer Art of Failure*. Durham: Duke University Press.
Halley, J. E., & Parker, A. (2011). *After Sex?: On Writing since Queer Theory*. Durham: Duke University Press.
Halpern, O. (2014). *Beautiful Data: A History of Vision and Reason Since 1945*. Durham: Duke University Press.
Hassan, R. (2007). Network time. In R. Hassan & R.E. Purser (Eds.), *24/7: Time and Temporality in the Network Society* (pp. 37-61). Stanford: Stanford Business Books.
Jarvis, H., & Pratt, A. (2006). Bringing it all back home: the extensification and 'overflowing' of work." *Geoforum*, *37*(3), 331-39.
Jenzen, O. (2017). Trans youth and social media: moving between counterpublics and the wider web. *Gender, Place & Culture*, *24*(11), 1626-1641.
Kane, C. L. (2016). Photo noise. *History of Photography*, *40*(2), 129–45.

Kirsch, S. (1995). The Incredible Shrinking World? Technology and the Production of Space. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, *13*(5), 529–555.
Kitchin, R. (1998). Towards Geographies of Cyberspace. *Progress in Human Geography*, *22*(3), 385-406.
Love, H. (2007). *Feeling Backwards: Loss and the Politics of Queer History*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Massey, D. (2005). *For Space*. Sage: London.
McGlotten, S. (2013). *Virtual Intimacies: Media, Affect, and Queer Sociality*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
Muñoz, J. E. (2009). *Cruising Utopia: The Then and There of Queer Futurity*. New York City: New York University Press.
Nunes, M. (2012). Seductive errors: a poetics of noise. In: x. burrough (Ed.), *Net Work: Case Studies in Web Art and Design* (pp. 100-103). London: Routledge.
Paglen, T. (2010). Goatsucker: toward a spatial theory of state secrecy. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, *28*(5), 759-771.
Puar, J. (2007). *Terrorist Assemblages: Homonationalism in Queer Times*. Durham: Duke University Press.
Ruez, D., & Cockayne, D. (forthcoming). From affirmative to ambivalent critique: difference, affect, and the politics of plurality. *Environment and Planning C: Politics and Space*.
Sedgwick, E. (2003). *Touching Feeling: Affect, Pedagogy, Performativity*. Durham: Duke University Press.
Smith, N. (1992). History and philosophy of geography: real wars, theory wars. *Progress in Human Geography*, *16*(2), 257-271.
Southerton, D. (2003). 'Squeezing time': allocating practices, coordinating networks and scheduling society. *Time & Society*, *12*(1), 5-25.
Starosielski, N. (2015). *The Undersea Network: Sign, Storage, Transmission*. Durham: Duke University Press.
Turner, F. (2006). *From Counterculture to Cyberculture: Stewart Brand, The Whole Earth Network, and the Rise of Digital Utopianism*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
Virilio, P. (1998). Architecture in the age of its virtual disappearance. In: J. Beckman (Ed.), *The Virtual Dimension: Architecture, Representation, and Crash Culture* (pp. 178-187). New York: Princeton Architectural Press.
Wiegman, R., & Wilson, E. (2015). Antinormativity's queer conventions. *differences*, *26*(1), 1-25.
Williams, R. (1974). *Television: Technology and Cultural Form*. London: Routledge Classics.
Zalnieriute, M. (2018). The anatomy of neoliberal internet governance: a queer critical political economy perspective. In: D. Otto (Ed.), *Queering International Law: Possibilities, Alliances, and Risks* (pp. 53-74). London: Routledge.
Zook, M. (2000). The web of production: the economic geography of commercial Internet content production in the United States. *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space*, *32*(3), 411-426.